UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X Docket#

TROOPER 1, : 22-cv-00893-LDH-TAM

Plaintiff,

- versus - : U.S. Courthouse

: Brooklyn, New York

NEW YORK STATE POLICE, et al.,:

: November 13, 2024

Defendants : 4:34 p.m.

----X

TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR DISCOVERY CONFERENCE
BEFORE THE HONORABLE TARYN A. MERKL
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

A P P E A R A N C E S: (VIA VIDEO/AUDIO)

For the Plaintiff: Valdi Licul, Esq.

Katherine Vask, Esq.

Wigdor LLP

85 Fifth Avenue, Fifth Floor

New York, NY 10003

<u>For the Defendants</u>: Daniel J. Moore, Esq.

Harris Beach PLLC 99 Garnsey Road Pittsford, NY 14534

(Appearances continue on next page)

<u>Transcription Service</u>: Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.

61 Beatrice Avenue

West Islip, New York 11795 RL.Transcriptions2@gmail.com

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound-recording, transcript produced by transcription service

#### APPEARANCES CONTINUED

For the Defendants: Rita M. Glavin, Esq.

Glavin PLLC

156 West 56th St., Ste. #2004

New York, NY 10019

Theresa Trzaskoma, Esq.

Sher Tremonte LLP 90 Broad Street New York, NY 10004

Catherine Foti, Esq. Kayasha Lyons, Esq.

Morvillo, Abramowitz, Grand, Iason & Anello P.C. 565 Fifth Avenue New York, NY 10017

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.

2

# Proceedings

THE CLERK: This is Civil Cause for Discovery Conference, docket 22-cv-893, Trooper 1 v. New York State Police, et al.

Before asking the parties to state their appearance, I would like to note the following. Persons granted remote access to proceedings are reminded of the general prohibition against photographing, recording, and re-broadcasting of court proceedings. Violation of these prohibitions may result in sanctions including removal of court-issued media credentials, restricted entry to future hearings, denial of entry to future hearings, or any other sanctions deemed necessary by the Court.

Will the parties please state their appearances for the record starting with the plaintiff?

MR. LICUL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Valdi Licul; Wigdor LLP, for the plaintiff Trooper 1. And I'm here with my colleague, Katherine Vask.

THE COURT: Could you spell Ms. Bask's [sic]

19 last name for me, sir?

MR. LICUL: The last name is V-A-S-K. She hasn't yet filed a notice of appearance but will do so shortly.

THE COURT: Okay. I'm sorry, did you say D as in dog or B as in boy?

MR. LICUL: V as in Victor.

```
4
                            Proceedings
1
              THE COURT: V as in Victor. So I'm glad I
 2
    asked.
           Okay, thank you.
 3
              MR. LICUL: You're welcome.
              THE COURT: And on behalf of the defendants?
 4
 5
              MR. MOORE: Your Honor, Daniel Moore from the
 6
   Harris Beach firm on behalf of the New York State Police.
 7
              THE COURT: Okay. For Mr. Cuomo, who do we
 8
   have?
 9
              MS. GLAVIN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Rita
10
   Glavin, G-L-A-V-I-N, at Glavin PLLC. I am here along
11
   with my co-counsel Theresa Trzaskoma, T-R-Z-A-S-K-O-M-A
12
   of Sher Tremonte for former Governor Andrew M. Cuomo.
              THE COURT: Okay. Anybody else on the line on
13
14
   behalf of the parties?
15
              MS. FOTI: Yes, your Honor. Catherine Foti.
16
   I'm here with Kayasha Lyons from Morvillo, Abramowitz,
17
   Grand, Iason & Anello on behalf of Melissa DeRosa and
18
   Richard Azzopardi to the extent there's a potential
19
   appeal.
20
              THE COURT: I understand. And to the extent --
21
   so just remind me, Ms. Foti, as to the current status of
22
   the briefing as to the amended complaint. Was there --
23
   or maybe Mr. Licul is the best person to ask. Were you
24
    seeking to add some facts against Mr. Azzopardi or is it
25
   related to Ms. DeRosa?
```

5 Proceedings 1 MS. FOTI: It was only --2 MR. LICUL: Just Ms. DeRosa. The motion --3 sorry, Cathy. 4 MS. FOTI: No, go ahead. 5 MR. LICUL: So not as to Mr. Azzopardi, just 6 Ms. DeRosa. The motion is fully briefed and we're 7 waiting for a decision on the motion to amend. 8 That was my understanding of the THE COURT: papers when I just reviewed them in connection with the 9 10 most recent opinion we issued in the OAG docket and I just wanted to confirm that I was reading the papers 11 12 correctly. So thank you for that. It just helps me to 13 understand the framing in terms of who's still in the 14 case and what the discovery issues are. 15 So I'm told that there is a nascent or perhaps 16 ripening dispute regarding a deposition issue. Mr. 17 Licul, would you like to give me an overview of where we 18 are? 19 MR. LICUL: Certainly, your Honor. Several 20 weeks ago Trooper 1 was deposed. We were prepared to 21 move forward with the entire deposition that day. We got 22 through about six hours of the seven hours but the court 23 reporter had to leave, which is fine. So we scheduled 24 the second day which is this coming Friday. And we made 25 our position known to the defendant that we believe this

deposition could be done in the seven hours under the federal rules. Yesterday we got an email stating that they needed essentially a full second day.

Our response was prompt and it was that we didn't believe that to be true. But nevertheless, we would consent to an additional two hours, in other words, completing the last hour and an additional two hours to complete the deposition. And we believe that it's more than enough. I've gone over the transcript of the first day of Trooper 1's deposition which of course is in addition to her testimony before the AG and it covers virtually all of the topics and it covers the investigation, it's all of the incidents with the governor. It covers her communications, her search for documents.

The only thing that I can see plainly that's not yet covered is the issue of damages. So you know, that's a fair point. But everything else has been covered. No one has told us what other topics they need to fill an additional seven hours.

Unfortunately, when we made our proposal for an additional two hours we didn't get a response back, you know, with a counterproposal. So here we are. I'm sorry I have to bother you. But that's essentially framing the issue, your Honor.

Proceedings

THE COURT: All right. And Mr. Licul, do you have a sense of which defendants are driving this request for the additional time? Like who spent the bulk of the time in the first six hours?

MR. LICUL: Well, it was entirely the governor's counsel. And this was a topic of discussion as well. We repeatedly reminded defendant that, you know, even though there are multiple defendants, the issues overlap. And so we asked them to coordinate amongst themselves because clearly they don't each get to ask the same questions. But the only folks doing the questioning for the first six hours were counsel for the governor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. So who on the defense side of the table wants to take the lead on where you believe we are and why the parties can't resolve the outstanding deposition in three additional hours which would amount to more time than you're entitled to under the rules. Who's taking the lead there?

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, this is Dan Moore. And first, thank you very much for making the time and assisting us with this dispute.

This is a multiparty case and we understand that in an ordinary case seven hours are allowed. But you know, of course the notes make, you know, allow for

Proceedings

the fact that in multiparty cases sometimes there's a need to take more than seven hours. And you know, in those cases the parties need to work, you know, one side of the table needs to work together to avoid duplicative questioning. And you know, one attorney ought to be asking the questions with respect to our similar interests. And that's what's been done here. But some things need to be considered here.

First is this is a 35(h) complaint with 200 or so allegations. There have been tens of thousands of documents produced in discovery. There have been text messages produced that were not produced by the plaintiff but go back and forth to and from the plaintiff that we were not aware of until we found them through other means of discovery.

Two days before part one of the deposition on October 2nd, two days before, about 500 medical records were dumped on the defendants. So there is a lot to this case.

So understanding we want to be as surgical as we can in our questioning, the defense team has worked hard to ensure that we are not asking the same questions that -- there is one attorney, that would be Ms. Glavin, Governor Cuomo's counsel, who's going to handle most of the questioning and with our common interests she will be

asking those questions.

But there are certain questions that New York State Police is most interested in that are unique to its defenses. In this case there are Title 7 claims against only the New York State Police and there are unique defenses to Title 7 that don't apply to the other defendants. And there are questions about the New York State Police issues that we believe are important and that are separate from what the governor's defense will be.

So you know, our sense of this, your Honor, is that it's very hard to schedule all of the attorneys' be time. There are about eight attorneys that are involved. We have a day now where everybody can be there. We won't have to come back. We've agreed to limit this to just one day. Everybody will be there.

If we don't have the time we need, we believe it will be very unfair. For example, if this deposition were to end while Ms. Glavin is still moving through the common interest questions, then that would preclude the New York State Police from asking any questions at all.

And I might say, and Ms. Glavin can probably speak to this better than I can, but there are still -- when the deposition was adjourned on October 2nd, there were still more than half of the issues for the incidents

```
Proceedings
```

1 raised in the complaint we hadn't gotten to. We still 2 hadn't gotten to the damages.

situation.

And again, there are in total thousands of pages of medical records in this case. So there are a lot of text messages that go back and forth that we need to have answers on.

So your Honor, we're just asking just one day. That's it. We'll be done. And then we won't need to come back. We don't think that's unreasonable.

One of the things that the committee in its notes provided said that preoccupation with timing is to be avoided. So since this would not seem to inconvenience anybody, we're all going to be there anyway, we'll limit the deposition to just one day. We think it would be most reasonable to just get it done.

THE COURT: So how long do you think that the New York State Police specifically needs beyond Ms. Glavin's follow-up that she's planning to cover?

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, we would need approximately two hours is our sense, or approximately two and a half hours. And I know that there are questions that counsel for the individual defendant, Ms. DeRosa, also has that I believe are unique to her

THE COURT: Okay.

Proceedings

MS. FOTI: Yes, your Honor, just to add what our position is here, there were no questions about my individual defendants that were asked in the first session. You know, there are very specific allegations as to Ms. DeRosa. And I'm not even mentioning the other party right now who's not an active member of the suit. But still, there's still specific allegations that I really do need to inquire about especially if the judge decides that she's (indiscernible), you know, in this case.

We have talked to Mr. Licul. It's actually a number of additional discussions than I think he summarized. You know, he certainly got to the gist of what the issues were in terms of timing. But we offered to do whatever we could within an hour, hour and a half for my client.

THE COURT: Okay. So as I hear you so far, Mr. Moore is seeking two to two and a half hours. You're seeking an hour to an hour and a half.

Ms. Glavin, you already had six hours. What are you looking to accomplish on Friday?

MS. GLAVIN: Sure, your Honor. Thank you. First, with respect to, you know, what has not been covered, Mr. Licul is incorrect that everything has been covered and Mr. Moore is correct that there are about,

we're only through about half of the incident that

Trooper 1 has personally alleged involved her in the

complaint.

So we need to cover incidents still. We've gotten through, I don't know, maybe eight to ten of them and we have another eight to ten to go. And I should, you know, inform the Court that there are also with respect to allegations during the course of her deposition she provided some new information and allegations that she had never made before which required exploration on our part.

So that first is to finish through her allegations and complaint. And again, I have been tasked by co-counsel with getting through those allegations on behalf of the remaining defendants.

Second, and I think your Honor is aware of this, is that it came out in the deposition that Trooper 1 intentionally deleted text messages that she had with other state troopers in which she was discussing her allegations, the Attorney General investigation, and Governor Cuomo.

Shortly before her deposition, we received a production from another trooper on the PSU with whom she was communicating of many, many text messages with Trooper 1. We've gotten through a number of those text

messages but there are still some more to go through.

In addition, we have not -- she has included allegations with respect to another complainant and we do have to ask her just a series of questions about each of those for reasons I'm sure your Honor can understand and hopefully can tee up our motion practice.

In addition, we also need to explore, and this is a common interest, about some -- there were a number of issues that she was having at work and in her personal life during this period of time that are unrelated to Governor Cuomo and issues concerning her dislike of her job, wanting to leave her job, et cetera, that we need to explore. It also goes to damages about intervening causes of stress.

On the damages issue for which I've been tasked, you know, by the defendants to cover, your Honor is aware she had at least six different health providers, primarily mental health providers. 48 hours before her deposition in the first day, plaintiff produced 500 new pages of medical records that covered a period of three years, and they're pretty dense. And you know, there are conflicting reports of what she provided various healthcare providers as well as intervening we think causes that go to damages that we need to get through.

THE COURT: Which three-year period?

14 Proceedings MS. GLAVIN: I'm sorry, your Honor, I didn't 1 2 understand. 3 THE COURT: Which three years are you talking 4 about? MS. GLAVIN: From 2021 to 2024. 5 6 THE COURT: Okay. So after the events at issue 7 in this case for the most part? 8 MS. GLAVIN: Yes. And some during but it 9 appears that she did not go to get mental health, any 10 type of mental health treatment until after the Attorney General's report came out. 11 12 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 13 MS. GLAVIN: And there are just what she did 14 and didn't discuss. And there are -- and in addition, we 15 also have worker's comp records that were recently 16 provided by the New York State Police shortly before her deposition and we need to go through some of those as 17 18 well. 19 And I think there are also some phone records 20 we need to get through and we're trying to streamline 21 that as well. 22 Just so your Honor understands, we work -- I 23 think you started by asking us which of the defendants is 24 driving this. And what I want your Honor to know is that 25 we have worked quite collaboratively, the state police,

Proceedings

Ms. DeRosa's counsel, and myself, to go through what each of us plan to cover, who can cover, you know, common interests versus others to divide this up and do it as efficiently as possible. And that's, you know, what we aim to do. And everybody is available to do that and get this done on Friday. And given --

THE COURT: But your list of items is very ambitious, Ms. Glavin, especially if the other attorneys need time. So how much time do you expect would be required for everything that you just discussed in light of how long things took in the prior deposition? I mean I'm concerned, frankly --

MS. GLAVIN: Yeah, no, I agree. I agree with you.

THE COURT: No, let me finish, please. I'm concerned that you said you only covered about eight to ten of the incidents in the first six hours and that you still have eight to ten incidents to cover. You have to make strategic choices when you know you have a limited time in her deposition. And this is a single plaintiff case and it should not be that -- this is not the same thing as conducting proffer. You know, you have to be more strategic. So how much time do you think you need?

MS. GLAVIN: I think I have tried to slim this

down and in talking with defense counsel we think we can

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.

## Proceedings

get it done in three to four hours meaning all those 1 topics that I just discussed with you. I mean my goal is 3 to get all of those topics done in three hours. That's the plan. But again, I don't know what she's going to 5 answer on some of these.

And you know, Judge, look I get it but you know on some depositions, we've been doing a number of depositions in the Bennett case and they have taken longer. We've done depositions in the Bennett case that have actually taken longer than we initially thought that they were going to take.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. GLAVIN: And I will say that, you know, this is an important case. There are three defendants. This is allegations about approximately 20 different incidents over three years or more. And some of the information that we got in day one of the deposition was brand new.

19 THE COURT: Right. All right. Mr. Licul, 20 the --

21 MR. LICUL: Yes.

2

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: -- defendants as a group make a somewhat compelling point that this is a multi-defendant case and these are complicated allegations. course a little concerning if true that they received

#### Proceedings

- 1 complex medical records shortly before the deposition.
- 2 | That can slow things down a little bit.

3 So what is your position in light of all of the 4 requests? Basically, they think they can get it done if 5 you do the additional seven hours. Two hours or so for the New York State Police, an hour or two, two to two and 6 7 a half for the New York State Police, one to one and a half for Ms. Foti's client. I'm assuming you're going to 8 9 focus on Ms. DeRosa, Ms. Foti. And then another, you 10 know, three to four hours for Mr. Cuomo to cover the bulk 11 of the allegations since it sounds as though Ms. Glavin 12 is taking the laboring on covering the specific

So what is your reaction to all of that, Mr.

incidents, the texts, and things like that.

15 | Licul?

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. LICUL: My reaction, your Honor, is that the allegations by my client here, that what she personally observed are no different and in fact functionally less, fewer of them than in almost all of the cases that I have where a deposition is done in seven hours.

And I would like to say we disagree about what incidents were covered.

And I'd like to tell you, your Honor, I just reviewed the transcript and here are the subjects that

Proceedings

were covered just regarding the incidents with Mr. Cuomo.

The incident where he touched her stomach; the incident where he's asking her personal questions about marriage and her sex life; his offer to provide her a tour of the mansion; the allegation that he was flirty and creepy; the questions by Governor Cuomo about why Trooper 1 doesn't wear a dress; his request for hugs and kisses; his efforts to seek her out at events to pay attention to her; his conduct towards other female members of the PSU; the holiday party where Mr. Cuomo directed Trooper 1 not to reveal to anyone what they discussed; the culture of sexism in New York State Police; the elevator incident where he ran his finger down Trooper 1's back.

There was extensive questioning about whether Cuomo was known to joke. There was extensive questioning about Trooper 1's promotion to the PSU and how that happened. There were questions about her communications with her colleagues at various events. There were also questions that had nothing to do with the case but they spent time with. As your Honor understands that's a strategic decision. For example, whether members of the PSU agreed with Mr. Cuomo's political views regarding vaccinations and masks and bail reform; about some incident where the governor transferred a bunch of PSU

supervisors because of some fire. I don't know what it has to do with the case but we spent time on that. All right?

So I don't agree that there are half the allegations to go. If there are, that's news to me. I think most of this stuff has been covered. And as your Honor knows, if you give people more time, another seven hours, they will fill up that time and often it's not very efficient.

I still don't know from New York State Police or from Ms. DeRosa what unique issues they have. And I agree that the damages are something.

And finally, your Honor, you know, lots of cases have 10,000 documents or 50 or 100,000 documents. It doesn't mean you get to ask everyone about each document. The documents speak for themselves. You have to make some decisions about what to ask about.

And frankly, your Honor, I also think that this is a bit of an ambush. We clearly made our point known that we were going to hold them to the seven hours and then we modified our position to try to accommodate and avoid this. But to be told three days before a deposition we need a whole other day feels pretty opportunistic to us and it's unnecessary. So that's our position.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

20

## Proceedings

MS. GLAVIN: Your Honor, this is Ms. Glavin. Could I just be heard on what was covered and not covered? Because I just want to make the record if that's okay. THE COURT: Sure. MS. GLAVIN: So Mr. Licul is incorrect. We did not cover the Belmont stomach touching incident. He can look in the transcript. I'm very aware of what was covered and not covered because I'm doing the questioning. That was September 2019. We did not cover the incident about whether the governor had a conversation about asking her to go upstairs. We did not cover the incident of her allegation that the government remain a comment to another female trooper about going upstairs. We never covered the incident where she claims the governor claimed you're too old for me and can you handle pain? We did not cover the October 2019 Low Memorial incident.

We did not cover the 2020 incident where she claimed the governor tried to kiss her. We did not cover the January 2021 incident where he said you could drive my car. We did not cover the Moynihan Hall incident. We did not cover the sunglasses comment.

With respect to Mr. Licul's claim that irrelevant questions were asked about views of other

Proceedings

state troopers, this came because of text exchanges that Trooper 1 had discussing the politics of Governor Cuomo that she disagreed with, text messages with Charlie Brown and text messages and text messages with Kyle Shillingford. It goes to state of mind.

With respect to the issue about troopers being removed or quote/unquote retaliated against. Trooper 1 includes in her complaint, she makes the allegation that she believed Governor Cuomo to be vindictive or retaliatory towards other troopers. Those incidents are discussed in text messages that she destroyed and we got from another trooper or another source.

And with respect to, you know, Mr. Licul saying that he's been ambushed, we have said to him that we thought we were going to need more time. And we had hoped -- I mean Judge, we're not that far apart here.

We're not asking, you know, two additional days. Mr. Licul saying get it done in two additional hours, we're saying a full day of seven hours while everyone is available and let's just get it done. And I don't think it's inherently unreasonable in a case with the degree of medical providers, the volume of those records, the number of allegations that have been made, the fact that there were a number of text messages that she destroyed, most if not all of her text messages discussing this case

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.

ngs 22

#### Proceedings

1 and investigation.

And so therefore, when we had gotten them from other sources and they relate to a view about the governor or a bias had absolutely nothing to do with her feeling that the governor had harassed her, we have to ask about that. But we have really tried to be good about this and respect for the process.

THE COURT: Mr. Licul, is there anything you'd like to say in response?

MR. LICUL: Yeah. As Ms. Glavin was speaking, I'm looking at the transcript. So I would be looking on page 226 of the transcript. I don't expect to read this entirely for your Honor, but there's a question by Ms. Glavin about the tour. Clearly she asked about that. There's discussion about the touching of the stomach.

I mean so I just, you know, again, I think they need to be, I think they need to -- they can't go back and keep asking the same questions which I think was a big problem the first time around.

But other than that, we'll stand on our current argument.

THE COURT: Ms. Foti, is there anything you'd like to say?

MS. FOTI: Who was that to?

THE COURT: Ms. Foti.

MS. FOTI: For me? For me? I wasn't certain, I could hear you. I'm sorry, your Honor.

The only thing I want to say is that I am concerned about the concept that we're somehow ambushing Mr. Licul. We had been discussing this at some length trying to come to an agreement and we have not been able to come to an agreement. That's certainly the reason we've come to you. We really tried to avoid having to involve the Court in this discussion.

THE COURT: Okay. And anything you'd like to add, Mr. Moore?

MR. MOORE: Your Honor, not much. Again, thank you for your time. I think here this is a time and place where we have everybody together. I just don't see really how this could be an unreasonable to just have one more day to get this done. We'll all be there. We've agreed to limit things. We worked really hard to ensure that we are not asking duplicative questions. And you know, it's going to be hard to get this done in seven hours but we're going to do it. And then we'll be done with it.

So I'd kindly ask the Court to consider that, you know, these are questions that need to be answered in a complicated case and given the magnitude of what we have before us, I think it's a very reasonable proposal.

#### Proceedings

1 THE COURT: So Mr. Licul, as we have observed 2 and/or joked in the very many appearances we've had in 3 this case, the case is complicated. Whether or not it 4 needs to be complicated is a different question. But it 5 has become very complicated as you know. My concern, sir, is that if I give them four 6 7 hours say, (indiscernible), if I give them four hours, what I'm going to be facing on Friday afternoon is a 8 9 motion for a whole other day. And what I'm wondering, 10 Mr. Licul, is if we can have a firm agreement here on the record that this is it for all times and there's not 11 12 going to be any subsequent application, the parties are 13 going to stick to that. 14 So Mr. Licul, what are your thoughts on that 15 concern? 16 MR. LICUL: I mean, your Honor, in an ideal 17 world -- well first, let me address the issue of the 18 complications. I realize your Honor is probably 19 referring to the allegations about the other women. But 20 again, you know, that doesn't take that much time because 21 those are --22 THE COURT: No, I'm just referring to how 23 complicated a single plaintiff --24 MR. LICUL: I understand. 25 THE COURT: -- employment discrimination case

has become due to lots and lots of issues. At the
Brennan Center we used to joke when things would like
become an octopus. This case has become an octopus when
there is really one plaintiff who is the core
complainant.

And so I'm not casting aspersions on anybody.

I think the complexities have come from various corners in the case and, you know, I really do -- I wish you could see my face. I'm smiling. I'm not upset about it. It's just it has become complicated. And the discovery is voluminous as we know.

So I'm just concerned that even if I were to grant your application to keep the deposition shorter, that we would still be facing the same problem on Friday afternoon.

MR. LICUL: Well, a couple of things. You know, I don't think this is a particularly complicated sexual harassment case. This is not a discrimination case in the sense of talking about why someone was fired and getting into issues of pretext which can be rather complicated.

We have a finite set of allegations that they can ask Trooper 1 about which are essentially 40 paragraphs. Really it's not that many incidents. So I don't necessarily agree with defendants that this is

## Proceedings

somehow inordinately complicated.

I do think though that if we give them a, or the Court gives them rather the full seven hours, they will take the seven hours. And I do think that that's exactly what the rule is designed to prohibit. It requires folks to focus on the important things and not to meander. And giving them seven hours is going to allow for exactly that because I do not hear in anything that they've said seven hours worth of questioning. And I'm afraid we're going to be going back, you know, with respect to issues that have already been covered.

I would suggest, your Honor, if your Honor is going to do four hours, I suggest we do that. Require the defendants to focus, sharpen their questions, not ask the same question over and over again. And if they still have something left at the end of that four hours, I'm willing to talk about it but it should be narrowed. It should.

THE COURT: Ms. Glavin?

MS. GLAVIN: Your Honor, I just have to correct the record on this. I asked Mr. Licul to look through the transcript and see if there was a single question that asked about the Belmont stomach incident. There was not.

Your Honor, I get it why Mr. Licul wants to

Proceedings

limit it. I don't think it changes what we have all tried to do on the defense side with this. And it's particularly because we are hearing new allegations from Trooper 1 for the first time, things that were not in her first complaint, her amended complaint, or the proposed complaint that is pending, the proposed amended complaint that is pending before Judge DeArcy Hall, allegations that she did not make to the Attorney General's office or anybody else until she was in that deposition that we had to explore and that took time.

I don't know if she will have additional allegations as we go through these incidents that were not done in detail by the Attorney General's office, but they are critically important as to whether or not she was sexually harassed by Governor Cuomo, whether or not there was retaliation or any type of a quote/unquote hostile work environment.

And also, going to her state of mind because there are a number of allegations in her complaint dealing with what she believed based on what she heard from other state troopers.

MS. FOTI: Your Honor, it's Catherine Foti.

Can I just add that in some respects I feel like Mr.

Licul is completely ignoring the fact that there are two other defendants here. The state police did identify

Proceedings

very clear different issues that did not apply to either former Governor Cuomo or to my client. They've only asked for two, two and a half hours. We're asking for one, one and a half hours in a situation where my client has been defending this lawsuit for, you know, for two years and trying to understand exactly why she is in the lawsuit. And I don't think an hour or even an hour and a half is, you know, is very much.

And so we have significantly limited the time that we are requesting to understand why my client is a party here. I think she's entitled to have that. And there are certainly in the other issues which are really sort of stepping stones to somehow establishing any type of liability for my client. It's appropriate for Ms. Glavin to go through those issues. I mean we need all of those covered as well and we're only asking for a very small slice of time in addition to that.

And I think if you look at it, two and a half and one and a half, we're up to three to four hours just between the other two parties. And so it's no that much additional time that we would even spend, Ms. Glavin would even be entitled to have, to cover all those additional issues that really were in part -- we are banking on getting some answers to to try to understand the liability for our own client.

Proceedings

I just really would appreciate if we can have the additional time, one day. It is not unusual in a case of this nature to have the plaintiff deposed for two days rather than one.

THE COURT: All right. So I fully understand where you're coming from, Mr. Licul. And I of course agree with you that -- and I joke around with my law clerks that the legal process will take however long you give them. Right? If you have a day to get a motion out, you get it done in a day. If you have two weeks, you manage to make it take two weeks. Right? And I fully get it that you are concerned that they will use the full seven hours if I were to grant that amount of time.

But your answer to my prior question really did not address what I was getting at. What I was suggesting, sir, with respect to all involved in this case, is it has become needlessly complicated. I've been saying this for two years. It's become complicated from all sides. It's become complicated with regard to the discovery production, it's become complicated with regard to how the complaint is structured.

You know, Ms. Glavin absolutely needs to go through with Trooper 1 do you know Charlotte Bennett?

How? Did you observe anything with Charlotte Bennett?

## Proceedings

Did you know so and so? Did you hear anything that happened to her? She has to go through all that stuff because of the way the complaint is drafted. Perhaps she should have done it in the prior session. I don't know. But here we are with two defendants, three defendants, who need to continue the deposition.

So what I'm inclined to do is, you know, the parties have said -- the state police has indicated two hours, two and a half hours and Ms. Foti has indicated one to one and a half hours. So there we're talking three to four hours in total. And Mr. Cuomo suggested that he needs, you know, three to four more hours.

I am prepared to give you guys six hours collectively and that's it. So you need to be more strategic, Ms. Glavin. You need to figure out how to get to the questions, how to get to the point. As I said a couple of minutes ago, this is not a proffer. You don't get to go down every single rabbit hole even if it seems potentially interesting in the moment because you aren't going to have time. If there's stuff you need to have an on the record answer for, you got to get to it. And if there's stuff that would just be fun to cross on, you might have to wait for the trial if there's a trial. I understand you might want to have her on the record but you have to be mindful of the amount of time that you

Proceedings

have under the rules.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I also note with regard to my decision to extend the time that Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 30(d) specifically states that the Court must, and I put an emphasis on the word must, allow additional time consistent with Rule 26(b)(1) and (2) if needed to fairly examine the deponent. Given the fact that this is a three defendant case and that the allegations are substantial and there is a substantial body or volume of information that has been generated by the Attorney General's office and in discovery that the defendants fairly wish to cover, I think six hours, you know, five extra hours of deposition time is an appropriate extension of the amount of time to which the defendants in this case should be permitted to utilize. I understand, Mr. Licul, that you may object to that That is my opinion and that is my decision. So I really do mean it though, for the defendants, that's it. Anything that comes back to me on Friday afternoon or Monday that you need more time with Trooper 1, the answer is going to be application denied. Is there anything else we should cover today, Mr. Licul?

MR. LICUL: No. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Glavin?

```
32
                             Proceedings
 1
              MS. GLAVIN: No, your Honor.
 2
              THE COURT: Mr. Moore?
 3
              MR. MOORE: No, your Honor. Thank you for your
 4
    time.
 5
              THE COURT: Ms. Foti?
 6
              MS. FOTI: No, that's all. Thank you very
 7
   much, your Honor.
 8
              THE COURT: All right. Thank you all. Have a
 9
    good rest of your day. Take care.
10
                         (Matter concluded)
11
                                -000-
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I, MARY GRECO, hereby certify that the foregoing transcript of the said proceedings is a true and accurate transcript from the electronic soundrecording of the proceedings reduced to typewriting in the above-entitled matter.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee or attorney or counsel of any of the parties, nor a relative or employee of such attorney or counsel, or financially interested directly or indirectly in this action.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto set my hand this 14th day of November, 2024.

Transcriptions Plus II, Inc.

Mary Greco